

Findings

1. RV research conducted to date lacks the necessary scientific control needed to demonstrate conclusively the existence of the phenomenon.
2. Some isolated examples of operational "demonstrations" are impressive and often subjectively spectacular, but lack of scientific procedures precludes their consideration as scientific evidence of the phenomenon.
3. On balance, all existing information suggests that the phenomenon may possibly exist, only because a few of the operational results cannot be explained by other means.

Recommendations

1. Terminate, as and when individually feasible, all nonsystematic but research-oriented efforts designed to replicate previous and current nonsystematic R&D efforts; those to be terminated in their present forms include efforts at MICOM, AMSAA, and FTD.
2. Establish, at the national level (e.g., NSC), a coordinated program to include fundamental systematic research; applied, operations-oriented R&D to systematically quantify the phenomenon; and limited intelligence-related "trials" to provide feedback/feedforward to other activities.
3. Provide adequate guarantees, long-range support and stability, and all accessses to management of this coordinated program; assure that all RV DoD-funded activities are through this program office; staff program office with scientific managers knowledgeable, competent, and nationally recognized in the highly pertinent technical and scientific areas (e.g., behavioral research methodology, experimental design and statistics, intelligence, physics, etc.).

Rationale and Opinion

It appears accurate to say that all operational/applications "examples" of RV lack the scientific control and reporting precision necessary for their inclusion in a scientific data base. Most, but not all, of these examples can be explained by hypothesizing means of information reception other than paranormal RV. Thus, one is tempted to discount the operations/applications examples as not providing adequately controlled data collection and evaluation, statistical analyses, target specifics, and the like. Generally, this assertion is true. Moreover, all such examples suffer from methodological flaws if they are evaluated from a scientific standpoint. Research in this area is amateurish from a behavioral sciences viewpoint.

However, some of the information from some of these examples cannot plausibly be explained by non-RV processes. Furthermore, the nature of the information contained in the transcripts which cannot be explained by non-RV processes seems well beyond that which appears logical or a result of "leading" of the subject, guessing, or even fraud. It is my opinion that we should carefully weight and evaluate these particular examples before we routinely discard them, with other examples, as having inadequate scientific and experimental control to be considered part of a scientific data base. ("Throwing out the baby with the bath water" comes to mind here.)

For reasons of classification, these specific examples will not be described in detail here. Rather, aspects of those examples which appear to provide the greatest anecdotal support for the existence of RV with no other seemingly plausible explanation, are listed below:

1. Scale accuracy in PNUTS.

SG1A

The above are not offered to support any conclusive claim of the existence of RV. However, they do include examples which appear impressive when viewed against "explanations" such as random or a priori response probabilities, context guessing, interviewer leading, deliberate falsification, and other non-RV concepts. To deny the likelihood of the existence of RV due to lack of adequate scientific data in the face of these examples, in my opinion, is possibly impulsive and far too simplistic a conclusion. Granted that it is difficult to conceptualize an R&D program having as its objective the proof of the existence of RV and its quantification, the alternative "out" of disregarding these examples because they are "bad science" appears at least equally inappropriate.

#### Possible Program Structure

Continuation of "applications/operations" types of activity, such as that in Florida and Maryland, should continue, but should have and could benefit from some scientific discussion and guidance.

Simultaneously, two avenues of activity could proceed in a related parallel fashion. The first would be a basic R&D program designed to "prove" or "disprove" the existence of RV. (This is an extremely difficult task, requiring very careful methodologies.) The second would be an "advanced development" task, which accepts the existence of RV, and then attempts to quantify its limits, accuracies, resolutions, etc.

These latter two tasks can be criticized on the basis that "we do not know how to do this scientifically." That is undoubtedly true, and thus a team of the best available people will be required. Conversely, if we agree that past research in this area has been "amateurish" and poorly done, then it follows that we know in part at least what not to do, and that is the first step toward improvement. I do not believe that competent scientists, from the proper discipline backgrounds, cannot make significant advances in researching RV if the appropriate commitments are made to them.

#### Estimated Costs

The following are strictly wild guesses as to manpower costs for the three tasks discussed. Considerable travel, computer, facilities, and other costs should be added.

##### Task 1. Research on Existence of RV

Professional Staff: 12  
Supporting Staff: 10  
Project Duration: 4-5 years

##### Task 2. Quantification of RV Limits

Professional Staff: 8  
Supporting Staff: 15  
Project Duration: 6-8 years

##### Task 3. Applications/Operations

Probably double the size of the current Maryland-based activity.

Estimated Yearly Cost, Tasks 1 and 2 Only: \$3 million.